

United States Patent and Trademark Office




UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/828,511 | 04/20/2004 | Edmond Glen Chenier | 4292 | |
| 7590 05/06/2005 | | | EXAM | INER |
| Edmond Glen Chenier | | | LE, MARK T | |
| 1216 Brook Drive Allen, TX 75002 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 3617 | 3617 |

DATE MAILED: 05/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.





UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

DATE MAILED:

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

| APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION | | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|---------------------------------|-------------|--|----------|---------------------|
| | | | | |
| | | | EXAMINER | |
| | | | | ···· |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER |
| | | | | 05032005 |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

An Interview Summary including the following attachements:

- 3 pages faxed from Mr. Chenier.
- 1 page Amendment Proposal

Mark T. Le
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 3617

PTO-90C (Rev.04-03)

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|---|--|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | 10/828,511 | CHENIER, EDMOND GLEN |
| Examiner-initiated interview Summary | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Mark T. Le | 3617 |
| All Participants: | Status of Application: | |
| (1) <u>Mark T. Le</u> . | (3) | |
| (2) Edmond Glen Chenier. | (4) | , |
| Date of Interview: 2 May 2005 | Time: | |
| Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: | nt's representative) | |
| Part I. | | |
| Rejection(s) discussed: | | |
| Claims discussed: 1-3 | | |
| Prior art documents discussed: | | |
| Part II. | | |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL See Continuation Sheet | RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS | S DISCUSSED: |
| Part III. | | |
| ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate r directly resulted in the allowance of the application. | ecord of the substance of the | interview, since the interview |
| ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate r did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summar | ecord of the substance of the y by the examiner appears in | interview, since the interview Part II above. |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| Ma Was 5/2/05 | | |
| (Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant | /Applicant's Representative S | ignature – if appropriate) |

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Mr. Chenier informally proposed new claims 1-8 for consideration. See the attached proposal faxed to the examiner on 4/27/05. In response, the examiner indicated that said claims would not place the application in condition for allowance. To assist Mr. Chenier, the examiner offered new claims 4-6 (see the attachment) to replace original claims 1-3 so as to place the instant application in a better condition for allowance. In response, Mr. Chenier accepted the examiner's proposal.